

Dan DeGraff
MI Concrete Assoc.

MCA Comments on Substitute for Senate Bill No. 879

9-7-16

The idea behind the life cycle process is to assure that valid competition is maintained on pavement investments made by the citizens of Michigan.

1. Section 1h (1) line 3: Pavement cost exceeded 2,000,000.00

The change from 1,000,000.00 to 2,000,000.00 is unwise and not in the best interest of the citizens of Michigan.

This would eliminate the vast majority of projects from the requirement that a life cycle analysis be developed for the project. Very few projects would be considered.

A \$ 2,000,000.00 pavement cost would cover a two lane road:

HMA 1 ½ inch overlay – 25 miles

HMA 6 inch overlay – 6 miles

Concrete pavement 8 inches – 6 ½ miles.

2. Section 1h (4) (A) line 14-15: ~~states with similar climates, soil structures, or vehicle traffic~~
another state or a foreign country that otherwise comply with the laws of this state.

Climate, soil structure and vehicle traffic are critical elements in the performance of any pavement structure. Pavements are specifically designed to accommodate these conditions. Designs that may work in areas with different climates, soil structures and traffic loadings cannot be expected to perform the same in other locations. The requirement for similar climates, soil structure and vehicle traffic must not be taken out.

The use of another state or a foreign country that otherwise comply with the laws of this state. What is the intent of this statement and is there any situations that this would apply? This line should be removed.

3. Section 1i (1) line 24: the department may conduct not more than 4 10 pavement demonstration projects each year

Developing 4 demonstration projects in a year is a tall order. The demonstration project idea was provided as a way for the department to ignore the requirement of cost comparison and best life time value when actual pavement history does not exist. The idea should be to develop better options but not too loose track of what we are doing. Between point 1 above and this one you would effectively eliminate this valuable tool

and no project would be evaluated by this process. The 4 demonstration project requirement is a reasonable number.

4. Section 1i (3) line 6 – 8: Nothing in this subsection requires that any individual demonstration project be duplicated with both asphalt and concrete.

Under the current language there has never been an attempt to duplicate projects for both pavement types. The whole reason for the life cycle assessment is to maintain a competitive environment. It is critical to maintain a balanced program with both pavement types afforded the opportunity to benefit from new, innovative and promising enhancements. Without some reasonable balance one pavement type may gain tremendous advantage from the investment and thus gaining a competitive advantage using public funds.

The balancing of pavement demonstration dollars over a two year period has maintained the competition required to make this process work. The legislation needs to maintain this language.